relied upon this argument as justifying the issuance of the Writ, Respondents did not address it in their Brief in Opposition, thereby evidencing their inability to dispute it.

Respectfully submitted,

ROBERT F. HUNT
Counsel of Record for Petitioner

HUNT, HASSLER & LORENZ LLP
100 Cherry Street
P.O. Box 1527
Terre Haute, Indiana 47808
(812) 232-9691, Fax (812) 234-2881

EDGAR PAUK, ESQ.
144 East 44th Street, Suite 600
New York, New York 10017
(212) 983-4000

Ninth and Seventh Circuits. The Court granted the change of venue motion, however, holding that, "[u]nlike state law, federal law does not provide a choice of law analysis that might enable a court to make a principled decision between the law favoring the plaintiff and that favoring the defendant. . . . It is better to proceed on the presumption that in a unitary system, any court within the system would reach the same result in a federal question case." At *4. Such presumption would be entirely fictitious if this Court did not settle the law of the land, thereby creating a unitary system in fact, not only in theory.